

# Academic Dishonesty: Pre-Service Teachers' Practices on E-Assessment

Kristine Joyce P. Arrubio, Allyssa M. Melo, Jolo L. Monje, Elaisa M. Pineda, Joyce M. Soriano, Anna Lucy D. Torno, Danniella Joy S. Vital

Department of Education, Don Honorio Ventura State University, Pampanga, Philippines

## Authors Name/s:

Kristine Joyce P. Arrubio - arrubiokristinejoyce@gmail.com

Allyssa M. Melo - allyssamaalameo@gmail.com

Jolo L. Monje – monjejolol@gmail.com

Elaisa M. Pineda - pinedaelaisa1995@gmail.com

Joyce M. Soriano - joycesoriano003@gmail.com

Anna Lucy D. Torno – tornoannalucyd@gmail.com

Danniella Joy S. Vital – danniellejoyvital@gmail.com

**Abstract:** *An academic infidelity is an education quality disability. Since we are now living in a cyber world, dishonesty seems to be essential as truthfulness. Hence, this study investigated the pre-service teachers' practices in dealing with academic dishonesty on e-assessment. Further, it employed mixed-method approach utilizing triangulation. Thus, standardized and adopted instruments were used to ensure validity and reliability of the study. Furthermore, purposive sampling was used in identifying the responses of the two hundred ninety-six (296) pre-service teachers in an extension campus of a State University revealed that pre-service teachers much recognized their level of perception towards academic dishonesty. It is an alarming result that respondents are committed to do the action and sometimes motivated for their cheating behavior. Nonetheless, participants might consider doing dishonesty as a preventive measure. Further, hypotheses need not to accept since significant relationship was exhibited among the variables. Then, to minimize academic dishonesty, it is recommended that teacher must have online monitoring on students while taking an assessment. Alternative and authentic assessments must also be encouraged in assessing higher thinking skills. Moreover, University and policy makers must implement policies related to academic dishonesty in remote assessment. For future researchers, more in-depth studies incorporating other elements and programs affecting academic dishonesty on e-assessment may be contemplated.*

**Keywords— Academic Dishonesty, e-Assessment, Perception, Motivation, Cheating Behavior, Prevention**

## 1. INTRODUCTION

An academic infidelity is an education quality disability. Since we are now living in cyber world, dishonesty seems to be essential as truthfulness. Considering the demand of literacy in today's world, the educational system need to adapt in distance learning, hence, online learning put into the picture. Moreover, e-assessment is an integral part of this learning modality as defined by (Shute V. & Kim Y.G, n.d) that e-assessment is refer to methods or tools made by the teacher to evaluate, measure, and assess student's performance in an online platform. This includes activities, quizzes, and any related academic assessment that happens online.

As stated by Keith (2018), the rapid advancement of digital technology has provided new opportunities for students to engage on academic dishonesty. This only implies that academic dishonesty entered the digital classroom. Digital natives are now part of the "copy and paste" generation in which dishonest behavior is only a click away. Moreover, in the context of online learning, Bailey (2019) claimed that students are taking the advantage of technology for them to cheat. As mentioned by Nyzova (2019), problem of academic dishonesty is growing at an enormous pace. Academic dishonesty has become one of the most serious

problems that colleges and institutions throughout the world have encountered over the years. Students are more likely to use online plagiarism, collaborate on copying test answers, and hire others to produce coursework for them, according to Paul Sopcak. Exam cheating is a prevalent form of dishonesty in which students cheat to gain a better grade.

In global, there have been numerous reports on academic dishonesty in the college classroom (Sheard 2003). Hence, academic dishonesty occurs not only in a face-to-face environment, but also online, where the majority of students are proficient in the use of technology. In addition, academic dishonesty affects all students, according to Denise Simpson (2016), but it is particularly prevalent among international students. In Spring 2020, many universities revealed widespread cheating in online exams, and the problem became so widespread that it was also covered by the media. According to Yang (2016), some South Koreans refer to their nation as the "Republic of Plagiarism" due to the prevalence of intellectual integrity, academic fraud, and scientific misconduct in East Asian universities. Due to the prevalence of intellectual integrity, academic fraud, and scientific misconduct in East Asian universities, some South Koreans refer to their country as the "Republic of Plagiarism," according to Yang (2016).

According to Paul Sopcak, coordinator at the office of student behavior at MacEwan University in Alberta, Canada, contract cheating is always a concern. Contract cheating is when you take someone else's work and pass it off as your own. During the pandemic, these online contract cheating schools are thriving, Eaton said. "It's easy to see how the abrupt switch to online could facilitate cheating," Waddingham said. Therefore to ensure academic dishonesty will not take place, they used remote proctoring software to monitor online exams. For instance, students can't switch to a different window while taking exam. However, this form of surveillance in the homes of students has sparked serious privacy concerns. Faculty members have an opportunity right now to think on their teaching methods and evaluation methods in order to come up with suitable alternatives. They need to start looking at academic dishonesty from a pedagogical standpoint rather than a technological one, according to Sopcak. In Middle East College looked at the complexities of online evaluation in higher education. Preparing different questions for each student was found to be the most effective method for reducing academic dishonesty. In addition, integrating multiple evaluation procedures, such as presenting online, helps to decrease academic dishonesty by allowing the teacher to verify that the submitted work is the student's own work.

In locale, Penaredondo (2011) indicates that academic dishonesty is more frequent in online distance learning since data is promptly accessible and available. When a student goes on the web, a great many responses for tasks and tests can be obtained. The most widely recognized methods of cheating online and even in traditional setting are aiding and abetting. Abetting implies allowing your classmate to duplicate your work while aiding is helping each other answer a test. This can likewise be classified "group cheating". On the other hand, gathering cheating is done during tests when the students accumulate and answer the inquiries together. They'll assign questions to each other and exchange responses. Moreover, googling answers or activities, according to Perez (2011), are another way of cheating. Students use the Internet to identify relevant websites and simply copy and paste the content, claiming it as their own. Aside from this, Penaredondo (2011) states that another escape clause in online distance learning is that there is likewise a more noteworthy opportunity to give reasons or alibis. The basic assertions like power interruption, technical issues, mail delivery failure, and file corruption problem are the assertions that are difficult to prove (Atay, 2011).

Most of the schools now shift into online learning, which allows students to be more engaged in academic dishonesty. In today's internet world, there are powerful digital tools and platforms that assist students' academic dishonesty. If we choose to ignore academic integrity, student cheating is likely to continue unabated. In the local context, Ressureccion (2012) cited a large number of studies

on academic integrity conducted by Filipino scholars, the majority of which focused on cheating on assignments and examinations, with more than half of the studies involving

students at the primary and secondary levels. There appears to be a paucity of writing in the Philippines on ethical challenges confronting college students in the context of academic integrity in the digital age. Now that most of the universities shift in online learning, cases of academic dishonesty arose. Students at De La Salle- College of Saint Benilde allegedly paid to get past thesis requirements, according to Magsambol (2021). Moreover, a student asked another student to write his or her reaction paper for a three-hour video they had to criticize. Furthermore, some students pay someone else to do their homework for them. Academic dishonesty is also a problem at the DHVSU Sto.Tomas campus, according to one of the professors who works there. Some students have confessed to him that they cheated on their midterm exam. A student also cited a scenario in which their section was found engaging in academic dishonesty. Instructors must disrupt this loop by using educational approaches that foster a culture of personal accountability and honesty. Academic dishonesty which compromises the quality of education is a growing concern among academic institutions.

This study focused on the level of perception, cheating behavior, motivation, and prevention of pre-service teachers' towards academic dishonesty on e-assessment. Moreover, it can also help in mitigating dishonesty and unfairness in e- assessment towards the promotion of quality education.

The primary purpose of the study was to serve as basis in the plan of the University to mitigate cheating on e-assessment to attain a valid and reliable results/out on e-assessment. Additionally, it attempts to find solutions and measures for online instructors to best mitigate academic dishonesty and to assure a quality e-assessment. The findings will help them to be aware on the increasing different cheating behaviors students engaged on e-assessment. This will help teachers to improve testing formats and quality of online education for all students. Furthermore, students will be aware of the cheating behaviors they engaged on e- assessment. Also, parents who enrolled their children in this type of learning environment will have self-assurance that their children are given valuable, credible, and trustworthy online education. This study can be a basis and may be used as reference data in conducting new researches or in testing the validity of other related findings to further the study on pre- service teachers' practices towards doing academic dishonesty on e-assessment.

Figure. 1 The figure shows the overall outline of the entire research as it shows the variables and their interrelationship clearly and logically.

The study attempted to investigate the level of pre-service teachers' practices in dealing with academic dishonesty on e-assessment. It sought to answer the questions: what is the level of perception of pre-service teachers when it comes to dishonesty on e-assessment, what

is the level of cheating behavior of pre-service teachers towards dishonesty one-assessment, what is the level of motivation of pre-service teachers regarding dishonesty on e-assessment, what is the level of prevention of pre-service teachers in dealing with dishonesty one-assessment, is there significant relationship between perception and motivation to cheating behavior towards academic dishonesty one-assessment; and is there significant relationship between perception and motivation to prevention towards academic dishonesty on e-assessment.

Based from the aforementioned literature and framework, two hypotheses were established: 1) that there is no significant relationship between perception and motivation to cheating behavior towards academic dishonesty on e-assessment, and 2) that there is no significant relationship between perception and motivation to prevention towards academic dishonesty on e-assessment.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### Research design

This study attempts to investigate the level of pre-service teachers' practices in dealing with academic dishonesty on e-assessment. Also, to determine the significant relationship between and among the levels of pre-service teachers' perception and motivation to cheating behavior, as well as the significant relationship of perception and motivation to prevention towards academic dishonesty on e-assessments among pre-service teachers. The study utilized a mixed-method research design specifically triangulation design. Pre-service teachers asked to answer survey questions for the quantitative portion of the study. For the qualitative part of the study consist of six open-ended questions and focus group discussion was implemented, which provided the researcher with information that was used to validate the gathered data from the quantitative part. The study is both quantitative and qualitative in nature. The researcher finds it more appropriate and suitable to use the mixed method triangulation research design with the integration of both quantitative and qualitative approach in investigating the level of pre-service teachers' practices in dealing with academic dishonesty on e-assessment. According to Tashakkiri and Teddlie (2003), mixed-methods research is a research design, which enables the researcher to mix quantitative with qualitative data collection procedures to obtain deeper understanding of their topic. Pinto (2010) mentioned that mixed-methods offer deeper understanding of the data that are gathered and allows for triangulation between the quantitative and qualitative data. Moreover, triangulation improves the validity of the research. It also provides a more holistic view than single method studies.

### Population of the Study

The researchers had came up with two hundred ninety-six (296) students pre-service teachers as respondents from first year to fourth year college at Don Honorio Ventura State University in Moras, dela Paz, Sto. Tomas, Pampanga with the totality of. These are the students who are enrolled in the second semester academic year 2020-2021.

## Research Instrument

The researchers used questionnaires with quantitative and qualitative statements. The quantitative part of the questionnaire was adopted by the study of Gaskill (2014), the perception, cheating behavior, and motivation was developed by Yardley et.al (2009) with a Chronbach alpha reliability of ( $\alpha$

= .78). On the other hand, the preventive part was developed by Carpenter D. D et. al. (2006), with Chronbach alpha reliability ranging from ( $\alpha$  =.69-

.95). This questionnaire is securely delivered online via Google forms. Open-ended questions were included to assist in interpreting the results and added depth meaning to this study. This employed with the main concern of hypothesis formulation, testing and analysis of relationship between independent variables and dependent variables. The instrument is divided into five (5) parts; the first section is the level of pre-service teachers' perception towards academic dishonesty. The scales is composed of 17 items, the respondents rated 1 –I will never do it, 2-I probably do it, 3 –I will most likely do it, and 4 –I will definitely do it. Part II is the level of pre-service teachers' cheating behavior engaged in academic dishonesty. The scales also composed of 17 items, the respondents rated 1 –never, 2-sometimes, 3 – often, and 4 –always. Part III is the level of pre-service teachers' motivation to cheat on e-assessment. The scales composed of 10 items, the respondents rated 1– strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3–agree, and 4–strongly agree. For the Part IV, it is the level of pre-service teachers' prevention in dealing with dishonesty one-assessment. The scales composed of 21 items, the respondents rated 1– strongly disagree, 2-disagree, 3–agree, and 4– strongly agree. The Part V of the questionnaire is the qualitative part created by the researchers. It consists of six open-ended questions about the pre-service teachers' perceptions, cheating behavior, motivation, and prevention of academic dishonesty on e-assessments. It was validated by the experts consisting of an I.T expert, linguist, psychologist, and an assessment professor.

The researchers used the interpretation table below to interpret the results.

Table 1  
 Interpretation Table (level of Perception)

Range	Interpretation
1.00 - 1.50	Very much recognize
1.51 - 2.50	Much Recognize
2.51 - 3.50	Recognize
3.51 - 4.00	Not recognize

Table 2  
 Interpretation Table (Level of Cheating behavior)

Range	Interpretation
1.00 - 1.50	Not committed
1.51 - 2.50	committed
2.51 - 3.50	Most committed
3.51 - 4.00	Highly committed

Table 3  
 Interpretation Table (Level of Motivation)

Range	Interpretation
1.00 - 1.50	Not motivated
1.51 - 2.50	Motivated
2.51 - 3.50	Sometimes motivated
3.51 - 4.00	Highly motivated

Table 4

Range	Interpretation
1.00 - 1.50	Would not considered
1.51 - 2.50	Considered
2.51 - 3.50	Mightconsidered
3.51 - 4.00	Definitely considered

Interpretation Table (Level of Prevention)

Focus group to provide triangulation. To give substantial information regarding the first part of the questionnaire, eighteen participants from the respondents are randomly selected to discuss or share their experiences towards academic dishonesty on e- assessment. Each session, the focus group will consist of nine (9) participants who will be interviewed by the researchers. Tashakkori and Teddlie (2003) agreed with Creswell's explanation of triangulation and added that the qualitative and quantitative data gathered complement one another because they each reflect their own perspective. The interaction of the focus group provided additional insights in the study.

#### Data Gathering Procedure

The researchers crafted a letter of approval to conduct the study and before they administered the survey questionnaire at Don Honorio Ventura State University, Sto. Tomas Campus in Moras dela Paz, Sto. Tomas Pampanga. The data was collected via the administration of an online survey. The bulk of data collection is quantitative in nature, with qualitative data that are collected through the inclusion of six open-ended questions in the last part of survey instruments. The researchers explained to the respondents the importance of their responses to the study. The researchers requested the respondents to answer with all honesty. The researchers chose samples from a larger population of the BEED using a method based on the theory of probability sampling. Fraenkel, Wallen and Hyun (2012) state that in random sampling, "every member of the population presumably had an equal chance of being selected. After the respondents answered the

questionnaire, the researchers collected and tallied the data for interpretation. The researchers interpreted the data and validated using supporting statements from the responses of open-ended questions and focus group discussion. At the end, the researchers came up with the conclusion and recommendations for this study.

#### Statistical Treatment

The data was collected, processed, and computed using SPSS (Statistical Packages for Social Science version 15). In order to describe and analyze the study's aims, statistical treatments such as tally, weighted mean, and Pearson(r) are used.

#### RESULTS

As can be seen on table 5 showing the pre- service teachers perception when it comes to academic dishonesty, the mean values are ranging from 1.243 to 2.068. The item number 9 "Paying online answered materials/services from the internet" has a lowest mean which is 1.243. This indicates that pre-service teachers perceived paying for online answered materials/services as an academic dishonesty.

Table 5

Respondents' Level of Perception on Academic Dishonesty

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1.Taking information from the internet without citing sources	1.686	0.708	Much recognize
2.Copying from the internet without citations	1.598	0.657	Much recognize
3. Receiving homework answers via email/chat	1.652	0.775	Much recognize
4. Receiving quizzes' answers via email/chat	1.585	0.763	Much recognize
5.Emailing/chatting friends with answers	1.585	0.658	Much recognize
6.Taking pictures (screenshots) of exam questions	1.416	0.632	Very much recognize
7.Sending pictures (screenshots) of exam questions to others	1.341	0.560	Very much recognize



8.Sending pictures (screenshots) of answers to homework questions to friends	1.544	0.631	Much recognize	16.Receiving electronic notes on graded assignments or projects	1.524	0.674	Much recognize
9.Paying online answered materials/services from the internet	1.243	0.496	Very much recognize	17.Copying materials from friends using the copy and paste feature	1.409	0.652	Very much recognize
10.Using electronic notes stored on devices during exam (e.g., cell phone)	1.456	0.626	Very much recognize	<b>Total mean</b>	<b>1.543</b>	<b>0.667</b>	Much recognize
11.Using notes stored on laptop while taking exam	1.429	0.606	Very much recognize				
12.Searching homework questions on internet	1.068	0.825	Much recognize				
13.Searching quizzes questions on internet	1.537	0.683	Much recognize				
14.Searching exam questions on internet	1.514	0.689	Much recognize				
15.Sharing personal notes on graded assignments or projects	1.652	0.697	Much recognize				

working student who feels pressured to complete all of the tasks that have been assigned to me).”– P8 (FGD Session 2)

On the other hand, the recorded mean of 2.068 is the highest for the item number 12 “Searching homework questions on internet”. This means that respondents’ perception is “much recognized” searching homework questions on internet as the highest item for the academic dishonesty. This indicates that respondents searching homework questions on internet perceived as an academic dishonesty.

In general, with a total mean of 1.543 and a standard deviation of 0.667, respondents “**much recognized**” their level of perception in dealing with academic dishonesty.

To validate the result on the quantitative phase, here are some of the responses of the participants from FGD. Pre-service teachers “very much recognize” this behavior as academic dishonesty.

“Sakin naman po cheating kasi may mga different factors siya, like for example sa financial factors nagcocontribute siya sa cheating kasi para mapadali kong sagutan yung mga assessment kasi nga nagtatrabaho ako kailangan ko ng pera para may pakain or panload sa online class (For me there are different factors that contribute to cheating, like for instance, financial factor. Since I am a working student, I need money to buy foods and load).” – P9 (FGD Session 1)  
 “Kasi din po minsan dina makapag review at napepressure po lalo na working student po ako (I’m a

“Karagdagan sa insights, para sa akin, sa own opinion ko, eto yung isang bagay na alam nating mali, bawat isa sa atin, pero sa kasalukuyang teaching method orkasalukuyang panahon natin ngayon na online class, hindi maiiwasan ng bawat isa. Eto yung academic dishonesty na sinasabi, for example, alam ko naman sa sarili ko na mandaya, pero may time talaga na nagawa ko na, hindi ko naman sinasabing hindi kopa nagawa (Additional perspectives, in my opinion, this is the thing that we already know is wrong. Each of us can’t avoid it in our current situation, which is an online class. This is what we refer to as academic dishonesty; for example, I

know how to cheat and have done it in the past. I'm not denying that I've done it before)."– P4 (Session 2)

Thus, it reveals that the respondents are perceived this academic dishonesty. The results from this variable, to some degree, seem congruent and comparable with findings from studies conducted in Western university settings (Carmichael et al. 2012). Based on the student perceptions, a considerable amount of academic dishonesty is occurring at the institution. Results show a gap between students' beliefs and their actions. The majority of the students believe that this kind of dishonesty is wrong, yet they still doing it.

**Table 6**  
*Respondents' Level of Cheating Behavior on Academic Dishonesty*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Taking information from the internet without citing sources	1.780	0.645	Committed
2. Copying from the internet without citations	1.710	0.646	Committed
3. Receiving homework answers via email/chat	1.699	0.709	Committed
4. Receiving quizzes' answers via email/chat	1.547	0.677	Committed
5. Emailing/chatting friends with answers	1.574	0.617	Committed
6. Taking pictures (screenshots) of exam questions	1.436	0.584	Not Committed
7. Sending pictures (screenshots) of exam questions to others	1.372	0.562	Not Committed
8. Sending pictures (screenshots) of answers to homework questions to friends	1.601	0.635	Committed
9. Paying online answered materials/services from the internet	1.243	0.522	Not Committed
10. Using electronic notes stored on devices during exam (e.g., cell phone)	1.487	0.622	Not Committed

11. Using notes stored on laptop while taking exam	1.429	0.639	Not Committed
12. Searching homework questions on internet	1.993	0.785	Not Committed
13. Searching quizzes questions on internet	1.534	0.637	Committed
14. Searching exam questions on internet	1.476	0.605	Not Committed

15. Sharing personal notes on graded assignments or projects	1.612	0.649	Committed
16. Receiving electronic notes on graded assignments or projects	1.460	0.620	Not Committed
17. Copying materials from friends using the copy and paste feature	1.365	0.554	Not Committed
<b>Total mean</b>	<b>1.548</b>	<b>0.630</b>	<b>Committed</b>

As can be seen on table 6 showing the respondents' cheating behavior towards academic dishonesty, the mean values are ranging from 1.243 to 1.993. The item number 9 "Paying online answered materials/services from the internet" has a lowest mean which is 1.243. This proves that the respondents are "not committed" in paying online answered materials/services online.

On the other hand, the recorded mean of 1.993 is the highest for the item number 12 "Searching homework questions on internet". This means that the Pre-service teachers are "committed" in searching homework questions on internet. To validate the result, here is one of the responses from FGD.

"Sakin po madalas sa google, for example po ano, kapag natataranta kang sumagot tapos hindi mo alam yung sagot mo, sigurado napo ako sa google (I always use Google when I'm in a hurry and don't know the answer)." – P7 (FGD Session 2)

To give substantial information, here are some of the responses of the participants from open-ended questions.

"Naghahanap ako ng mga materialsa internet lalo na kapag hindi ako familiar sa homework ko (For my homework, I'm looking for material on the internet, especially if I'm not familiar with it)." - R4.

"Yes sometimes, nagsesearch ako sa internet lalo na kapag di akonakapag review (Yes, I do search the internet occasionally, especially when I haven't reviewed something)." – R43

"Yes, kapag diko alam ang sagot nag gu google ako (Yes when I don't know the answers, I Google it)." - R148

In general, with a total mean of 1.548 and a standard deviation of 0.630, respondents' level of cheating behavior is "committed" towards academic dishonesty.

"Yun dun sa isang prof. kung kilala siya ng mga nasa meeting ngayon. Nagpaassessment siya sa mga third year college or yung sa mga learners natin and dun sa last part ng assessment niya nakakaano siya, nakakakonsensya. Talagang mapapa'oo ka nalang dun sa mga nagawa mo which is nag'cheat talaga ako during the examination. Meron mga questions dun na it is possible na masearch mo siya sa google so may mga part dun na sinearch ko siya sa google (If you know him, especially if you are a

third-year student, there is one professor. He designed a quiz for his students, and at the last part of it, your conscience will be awakened. I admit that I cheated the entire exam procedure on that final section of the exam because some of the questions can be answered simply searching on internet)." - R8 (FGD Session 1)

This indicates that the respondents are "committed" in academic dishonesty. The results from this variable is in contrast with the findings from study conducted by Hosny and Shameem (2014), strangely enough; paying someone to do an assignment seems to be a common practice among our students, where several of them have admitted committing this act.

**Table 7**  
 Respondents' Level of Motivation on Academic Dishonesty

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. Time constraints	2.595	0.775	Sometimes motivated
2. Difficulty of class	2.713	0.787	Sometimes motivated
3. Difficulty of exam/paper/assignment	2.770	0.756	Sometimes motivated
4. Unpreparedness	2.679	0.765	Sometimes motivated
5. Retaking the class	2.237	0.847	Motivated
6. Didn't like the teacher	1.919	0.815	Motivated
7. Had to pass the class: major or scholarship	2.507	0.913	Motivated
8. Pressure from parents/family	2.345	0.896	Motivated
9. Fear of failure	2.828	0.868	Sometimes motivated
10. To help a friend	2.777	0.850	Sometimes motivated
Total mean	2.537	0.827	Sometimes motivated

As can be seen on Table 7 showing the respondents' motivation regarding academic dishonesty, the mean values are ranging from 1.919 to 2.828. The item number 6 "Didn't like the teacher" has the lowest mean which is 1.919. This indicates that respondents were "motivated" to cheat on e-assessment because they disliked the instructor. To validate the result on the quantitative phase, here are some of the responses of the participants from open-ended questions.

"Yung ibang teacher hindi nadidiscuss ng maayos ang lesson (Some of the

instructors did not discuss the lesson well.” –R99

“*Kapag yung lesson di nadidiscuss ng maayos ng teacher (When the lesson was not thoroughly discussed by the teacher).*” – R124

On the other hand, the recorded mean of 2.828 is the highest for the item number 9 “*Fear of failure*”. This means that respondents are “sometimes motivated” to cheat on e-assessment out of fear of failing. To validate the result on the quantitative phase, here is one of the responses from FGD.

“*Ayun po madalas hindi na nakapag review, dahil po sa dami ng ginagawa, tapos po natatakot po na bumagsak, pressure na din po (That's why I often can't review, because of the amount of work, then I'm afraid of falling and I'm under pressure too.*” – R7 (FGD Session 2)

To give substantial information, here are some of the responses of the participants from open-ended questions.

“*Yes, since ayokong bumagsak sa subject (Yes, since I'm afraid to fail the subject).*” – R129

“*Yes ginawa ko dahil takot akong makakuha ng failing grade (Yes, I did it because I was afraid of getting a failing grade).*” – R192

“*Yes, natempt akong mandaya dahil ayokong bumagsak (Yes, I'm tempted to cheat since I don't want to fail).*” – R5

“*Kinakabahan ako at natatakot na bumagsak sa exam (I was nervous and afraid to fail the exam).*” - R265

In general, with a total mean of 2.537 and a standard deviation of 0.827, respondents are “**sometimes motivated**” when it comes to the level of motivation regarding academic dishonesty on e- assessment.

“*Siguro ano, nagkaroon kasi ng ibang priority yung ibang estudyante, nagkaroon kasi sila ng ibang opportunities, for example, yung iba is nakapag tutor, or nagkakaroon sila ng trabaho. Yung time nila na makapag review, hindi na nila nagagawa, kasi inilaan nila sa ibang bagay. Kaya siguro nagagawa din nila yon kasi nga, successful naman, nakapag cheat naman sila, nagagawa naman nila ng hinde nahuhuli, and alam naman din ng mga teacher yon kahit naman na hindi aminin ng mga student for sure (Perhaps some students have*

other priorities, such as having a job (tutor), which is why they cheat, and they are successful because they can cheat without being caught. Teachers are aware of this, even student don't admit it.” – R3 (FGD Session2)

“*Almost the same thoughts with other participants, siguro ma share ko nalang, kasi nagagawa lang natin yon, because of the pressure, since kailangan nating makapasa, nasanay tayo nung face to face classes na we always get high grades like that, motivated tayo sa pag-aaral, ngayon hindi ganon ka motivated, pero yun nga, ayawparin nating makakuha ng di ganon ka gandang grades, that's why nagagawa natin yung online cheating (We cheat because we are under pressure to pass, and we have almost the same thoughts as the other participants. Before, we are usually motivated to study because we want to achieve good grades.*

Unlike now, we are not as motivated, yet because we do not want to receive a poor grade, we cheat online.” - R9 (FGD Session 2)

“*Kaya motivated ang mga estudyante na mandaya dahil wala silang sapat na oras para sagutan ang exam (I believe the students are motivated to cheat during virtual assessments because they don't have enough time to answer the test or haven't reviewed the course).*” - R3

“*Para sa akin namomotivate ang mga estudyante na mandaya sa virtual class dahil hindi sila handa, walang sapat na oras para magreview at maraming pinapagawang activities at projects (Unpreparedness, in my opinion, can motivate a student to cheat in a virtual class, because with so many activities and projects to finish, the students do not have time to review).*” – R133

“*Motivated akong mandaya kasi hindi naman makikita ng mga teachers kung ano ang ginagawa namin sa virtual exam (Because no one from our professor can see what we performed on the virtual exam, that's why students are motivated to*



cheat).” – R14 “Motivated akong mandaya kasi kung ano-ano ang mga sinasabing mga teachers kaya wala akong maintindihan (I'm motivated to cheat since teachers talk about a lot of stuff, which is why I didn't understand anything).” – R83 “Para sa akin ang isang factor na makakapagmotivate sakin na mandaya ay kapag may surprise quiz, since hindi ako handa may tendency talaga na magcheat ako. Isa pa kapag hindi nagbigay ng mga needed resources ang teacher (I think factor that will motivate me to cheat is that when there is a surprise quiz.

Since I'm not prepared there is tendency that I shall commit cheating. Another factor is when the teacher fails to provide the necessary resources).” – R143

3. If the instructor discussed the institution's penalties for cheating	2.938	0.671	Might considered
4. If instructor discussed the penalties for cheating in this class	2.963	0.680	Might considered
5. If the instructor and the class discussed and agreed upon what constitute cheating in this course	2.949	0.633	Might considered
6. If the instructor knew my name	2.557	0.761	Might considered
7. If the	3.024	0.720	Might

This further explains that respondents are “sometimes motivated” to engage in academic dishonesty. The more students are motivated, the more likely they are to engage in academic dishonesty. The results from this variable, to some degree, seem congruent and comparable with findings from studies conducted by Feucht (n.d). Students agreed that cheating was more likely to occur among students who are afraid of what would happen if they did poorly in a class or failed that class. Furthermore, based in the study conducted by Gaskill (2014) the two items retaking the course and disliking the teacher was the least motivator to cheat. In contrast to the study conducted by Abdaoui (2018) good invigilation was ranked as students' third cause which entails that students are encouraged to cheat because the teacher does not invigilate effectively.

**Table 8**

*Respondents' Level of Prevention on Academic Dishonesty*

Indicators	Mean	SD	Verbal Interpretation
1. If the institution had an honor code that clearly described what constitute cheating and penalties for cheating	2.872	0.701	Might considered
2. If online classes were smaller	2.622	0.717	Might considered

instructor cared about my learning			considered
8. If the instructor discussed the importance of ethical behavior at the beginning of the term	3.091	0.733	Might considered
9. If the instructor encouraged students to be honest during the class	3.186	0.738	Might considered
10. If the instructor used multiple versions of the online exam randomly to students	3.047	0.707	Might considered
11. If the instructor used proctors in online examinations	2.980	0.679	Might considered
12. If the instructor allowed us to work in groups on homework	2.787	0.722	Might considered

13. If the instructor wrote fair exams and homework	3.047	0.677	Might considered	“considered” if the test were open book and open notes can prevent academic dishonesty on e-assessment.  On the other hand, the recorded mean of 3.186 is the highest for the item number 9 “If the instructor encouraged students to be honest during the class”. This means that respondents’ “might considered” if the instructor encouraged students to be honest during the class as prevention from academic dishonesty. . To validate the result, here are some of the responses from FGD.
14. If the instructor provided copies of prior exams for to the class so that we all had the same study materials	3.000	0.746	Might considered	
15. If the instructor provided a study guide or held an online review session before the exams	3.149	0.668	Might considered	“ <i>Para po sa mga instructor, siguro po pwedi po nilang sabihin sa mga students nila na hindi naman nila kailangan ipressure yung sarili nila habang nagtetest, I enjoy nalang nila ganon. Kasi hindi naman nasusukat yung talino natin sa score na makukuha natin doon sa test</i> (For the instructors, maybe they can tell the students that they don't need to pressure themselves while having the exam, they just need to enjoy it that way. Because our intelligence is not measured by the score we get in the test).” – R2 ( FGD Session 1)
16. If the tests were open book and open notes	2.351	0.797	Considered	
17. If the instructor put more essay questions on exams	2.581	0.750	<u>Might considered</u>	“Para po saakin siguro parang meron kasing isang professor na nagbibigay siya ng values sa huli na bawal mag cheat yun po (For me, if there is a professor that teaches students that cheating is wrong, that would be ideal).” – R6 (FGD Session 2)
18. If the instructor checked bibliographic references in students papers	2.706	0.657	Might considered	To give substantial information, here are someof the responses from open-ended questions.  “ <i>Hikayatin ang mga estudyante na wag mandaya</i> (Encourage studentsnot to cheat).” - R48 “ <i>Paalalahanin ang mga estudyantena maging tapat lagi</i> (Remind thestudents to be honest all the time).”  – R51
19.If the instructor stressed how other people are hurt by my cheating	2.608	0.728	Might considered	“ <i>Dapat ang guro hinihikayat lagi ang mga estudyante na laging maging honest</i> (The teacher mustencourage us to always be honest).”– R66 “ <i>Paalalahanin niyo kami na ang pagiging honest ay mahalaga at ang pandaraya ay hindi katanggap-tanggap na pag-uugali bilang isang professional future teacher</i> (Remind us that being honest is important and that cheating is not acceptable behavior for a future professional teacher).” – R126
20. If I felt the material in the course was important to my future career	2.90	0.663	Might considered	
21. if the institution provided a telephone hotline for reporting cheating	2.605	0.770	Might considered	
<b>Total mean</b>	<b>2.855</b>	<b>0.710</b>	Might considered	Generally, with a total mean of 2.855 and a standard deviation of 0.710, respondents are “ <b>might considered</b> ” their level of prevention in dealing with academic dishonesty.

As can be seen on table 8 showing the respondents’ prevention in dealing with academic dishonesty, the mean values are ranging from 2.351 to 3.186. The item number 16 “If the test were open book and open notes” has a lowest mean which is 2.351. This indicates that respondents

“*May software na tinatawag po na Proctor, basically yung ginagawa niya po is to detect if the student is cheating, yung teacher po imonitor niya po yung camera and microphones na*

*device na gamit ng student para ma avoid yung cheating. So ayun po, pwede pong ma implement ng school natin ito para ma avoid po yung cheating* (There is a software called Proctor, basically what it does is to detect if the student is cheating, the teacher will monitor the camera and microphones that the student uses to prevent cheating. Our school can implement this to avoid cheating).”

– R1 (FGD Session 1)

*“Para sa akin po pwede po yung ginagawa during face to face yung may set A, set B, pwede din pong gawin online para walang idea yung mga classmates niya* (For me, a set A and set B type of exam, comparable to what they conduct in face to face, is doable. It can even do this in an online setting, so students are unaware).” – R7 (FGD Session 2)

This clearly shows that the respondents might consider this measure as prevention on academic dishonesty. The results from this variable, to some degree, seem congruent and comparable with findings from studies conducted by Hendy and Montargot (2019), we found that attitude toward cheating the strongest predictor of academic dishonesty. This means that in addition to selecting in college students who are highly conscientious, educating those students about the honor code and the importance of upholding honesty values will help students form an honest attitude and one that is against academic dishonesty.

**Table 9**

*Pearson Correlation Coefficient Between Levels of Respondents’ Perception and Motivation with their Cheating Behaviors on Academic Dishonesty*

Bivariate	Cheating Behavior		
	r	p-value	Verbal Interpretation
Perception	0.838(**)	0.000	Significant. (There is high strong positive relationship between perception and cheating behavior of students.)

Motivation	0.478(**)	0.000	Significant. (There is low weak positive relationship between motivation and cheating behavior of students)
------------	-----------	-------	---

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 9 shows Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Levels of Respondents’ Cheating behavior and Prevention with their Perception on Academic Dishonesty. The analysis reveals that there is high strong positive relationship between perception and cheating behavior of students ( $r = 0.838$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ) and a low weak positive relationship between motivation and cheating behavior of students ( $r = 0.438$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ). Therefore, the result signifies that do not accept the hypothesis linking perception and motivation to cheating behavior towards academic dishonesty on e- assessment. Hence, this indicates that students perceived academic dishonesty is directly related to their behavior in committing to cheating. Similarly, students’ motivation toward cheating is also linked to their cheating behavior.

**Table 10**

*Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Levels of Respondents’ Perception and Motivation with their Prevention on Academic Dishonesty*

Bivariate	Prevention		
	r	p-value	Verbal Interpretation
Perception	0.169(**)	0.003	Significant. (There is low strong positive relationship between perception and prevention of students.)
Motivation	0.450(**)	0.000	Significant. (There is low weak positive relationship between motivation and prevention of students.)

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 15 shows Pearson Correlation Coefficient between Levels of Respondents' Cheating behavior and Prevention with their Perception on Academic Dishonesty. The analysis reveals that there is low strong positive relationship between perception and prevention of students ( $r = 0.169$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.003$ ) and a low weak positive relationship between motivation and prevention of students. ( $r = .450$ ,  $p\text{-value} = 0.000$ ). Therefore, the result implies that do not accept the hypothesis relating perception and motivation to prevention towards academic dishonesty on e-assessment. Consequently, this signifies that student perceived academic dishonesty is high level of association to their prevention.

### Conclusions

The major results of this study revealed that pre- service teachers much recognized their level of perception towards academic dishonesty. It is an alarming result that respondents are committed to do the action and sometimes motivated for their cheating behavior. Nonetheless, participants might consider doing dishonesty as a preventive measure. Further, hypotheses need not to accept since significant relationship was exhibited among the variables.

### Recommendations

It is alarming that respondents are committed to academic dishonesty. To minimize this, it is recommended that teacher must have online monitoring on students while taking an assessment. Alternative and authentic assessments must also be encouraged in assessing higher thinking skills. Moreover, University and policy makers must implement policies related to academic dishonesty in remote assessment. In addition, students should be always reminded of these academic integrity policies by their teachers. For future researchers, more in- depth studies incorporating other elements and programs affecting academic dishonesty on e- assessment may be contemplated.

### 3. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The researchers would like to acknowledge their deepest sincere gratitude to everyone who contributed their countless efforts and sacrifices, shared their expertise, and provided continuous support and advice.

Dr. Fernando Pamintuan, our professor, for providing us with the opportunity to conduct research and for his invaluable guidance.

To Mr. Reymond Q. Fajardo, our research adviser for his patience in valuable insights for the paper and for sharing his recommendations and thoughts for improvement all throughout the writing process; for his important guidance and experience, which considerably aided in the presentation and completion of this study;

To Don Honorio Ventura State University, for allowing the researchers to implement this study and most especially to Dr. Jovita G. Rivera. for her essential guidance and assistance during the preparation and completion of this study as well. In addition, the researchers would like to extend their

appreciation to all the teachers who gave enough time and support that helped the researchers to conduct their study.

To Mr. Karl Angel M. Gamboa, MSE, ECE, ECE, ECT; Ms. Kristine E. Manalastas, MAED; Ms. Josephine Luz D. Pineda, Ph.D.; Mr. John Paul Buduan, RPM; lastly to Ms. Ma. Agatha Anne D. Dizon, RGC, Rpm. The researchers are beyond thankful for the help of these people in correcting, suggesting and most importantly for validating their guided questionnaires that are needed on their study.

To all respondents, thank you for your time, trust, and kindness in providing the information needed to conduct this research.

To their very supportive parents, who acted as their greatest inspirations, for the love, support, and encouragement that motivates them to study hard.

To their friends, the researchers are beyond thankful for listening, helping, and sharing your ideas starting from the preparation down to presentation of this study.

Lastly, we truly thank GOD ALMIGHTY for providing us with sufficient power, knowledge, and skills to carry out this research. Without his guidance, this study will continue to exist as a concept only. All honor and glorious to Him.

### References

- Abdaoui (2018). *Strategies for Avoiding Cheating and Preserving Academic Integrity in Tests*. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326673058\\_Strategies\\_for\\_avoiding\\_cheating\\_and\\_preserving\\_academic\\_integrity\\_in\\_test](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326673058_Strategies_for_avoiding_cheating_and_preserving_academic_integrity_in_test) Atay, S. (2011). Final Exams. [IS201\_1\_2011]. Retrieved by: <http://myportal.upou.edu.ph/mod/quiz/review.php?q=59&attempt=470>
- Carmichael, M. et. al. (2012). *Harvard accuses 125 students of cheating*. The Boston Globe. Retrieved from: <http://www.boston.com/metrodesk/2012/08/30>
- Feucht, Alexander M.L. (n.d). The Perception of Academic Dishonesty among College Students of New Era University. Retrieved from: [https://www.academia.edu/23743774/The\\_Perception\\_of\\_Academic\\_Dishonesty\\_among\\_College\\_Students](https://www.academia.edu/23743774/The_Perception_of_Academic_Dishonesty_among_College_Students)
- Gaskill, M. (2014). *Cheating in Business Online Learning: Exploring Students' Motivation, Current Practices and Possible Solutions*.
- Hendy, N. T., &Montargot, N. (2019). *Understanding Academic dishonesty among business school students in France using the theory of planned behavior*. The International Journal of Management Education, 17(1), 85–93.
- Hosney, M. &Shameem F. (2014). *Attitude of Students Towards Cheating and Plagiarism: University Case Study*. Science Alert. Retrieved from: <https://scialert.net/fulltext/?doi=jas.2014.748.757>
- Magsambol B. (2021). *In remote Learning, Some Students Pays Someone Else to do their Classwork*. <https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https://www.rappler.com/newsbreak/investigative/students-paying-someone-else-do-classwork-remote-learning-setup&ved=2ahUKEwj0m-Ix4fyAhXDBt4KHbM3Ce8QFjAAegQIDhAC&usq=AOvVawOhF7d9RrCyrZsxrWM7CCTZrer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1553&context=gsbpapers>



- Nyzova K. (2019). The Science of Student Cheating: Motives and Ways Out. Retrieved from: <https://unicheck.com/blog/why-students-resort-to-cheating>
- Penaredondo, A., (2011). Final Exams. [IS201\_1\_2011]. Retrieved from: <http://myportal.upou.edu.ph/mod/quiz/review.php?q=59&attempt=476>
- Perez, A. (2011). Final Exams. [IS201\_1\_2011]. Retrieved from: <http://myportal.upou.edu.ph/mod/quiz/review.php?q=59&attempt=471>
- Pinto, R. (2010). *Mixed methods design*. In N. Salkind (Ed.). Encyclopedia of research design. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Inc, 813–819. Ramberg, J., & Modin, B. (2019). *School effectiveness and student cheating: Do students' grades and moral standards matter for this relationship?* *Social Psychology of Education*. Retrieved from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-019-09486-6>
- Ressureccion, P. F. (2012). *The impact of faculty, peers and integrity culture in the academe on academic misconduct among Filipino students: An empirical study based on social cognitive theory*. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(12), 33-50.
- Sheard, J., Markham, S., & Dick, M. (2003). *Investigating differences in cheating Behaviors of IT undergraduate and graduate students: The maturity and motivation factors*. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 22(1), 91-108.
- Shute V. & Kim Y.G. (n.d). *E- Assessment*. Retrieve from: <https://myweb.fsu.edu>
- Simpson, D. (2016) "Academic Dishonesty: An International Student Perspective," *Higher Education Politics & Economics*: Vol. 2 : Iss. 1, Article 5. Retrieved from: <https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/aphe/vol2/iss1/5>
- Sopcak, P. (n.d). *Cheating becoming an unexpected COVID-19 side effect for universities*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/ch-eating-becoming-an-unexpected-covid-19-side-effect-for-universities-1.5620442>
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (Eds.). (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Retrieved from: <https://methods.sagepub.com/book/sage-handbook-of-mixed-methods-social-behavioral-research-2e>
- Thomas, K. (2018). *Literature Review: Academic Dishonesty – What Causes It, How to Prevent It*. Retrieved from: <https://academictech.uchicago.edu/2018/11/16/literature-review-academic-dishonesty-what-causes-it-how-to-prevent-it/>
- Waddingham (n.d). *Cheating becoming an unexpected COVID-19 side effect for universities*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/edmonton/ch-eating-becoming-an-unexpected-covid-19-side-effect-for-universities-1.5620442>
- Yang, R. (2020). *Reassessing China's higher education development: a focus on academic culture*. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 16(4), 527–535.